

**Minutes of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the Management Board of the  
Orange House Trust Fund Foundation (TBM3),  
combined with the  
1<sup>st</sup> Joint Meeting of the Management Board of the Orange House Partnership (PMB)  
and the Management Board of the Orange House Trust Fund Foundation (TMB),  
held on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2011 from 09:30 – 13:00 at  
Rond Point Schumann 9, Brussels, Belgium**

**Agenda Item 1: Opening of the meeting, adoption of the draft agenda  
[Documents: TFF/MB/M/A(2011)1/REV1; JM/M/A(2011)1]**

1. Following the information from the Secretariat that Kalimi Mworira, Ezzeddine Boutrif and Vittorio Silano of the Management Board of the Orange House Trust Fund Foundation (TMB) were all unable to attend for reasons related to unexpected last minute travel missions or mission extensions, the members of the two management boards present, i.e., Alan Goldberg (PMB), Coenraad Hendriksen, (TMB), Horst Spielmann (PMB and TMB) and Herman Koëter (PMB and TMB), agreed to combine the third meeting of the TMB (TBM3) and the first Joint Meeting of the two Boards and merge both agendas. Furthermore all present agreed that Alan Goldberg (AG) should chair the meeting.

2. The meeting agreed to merge the agendas of TBM3 and JM1 as follows:

Agenda item	Documents
2. <u>For adoption:</u> Draft minutes of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Management Board of the Orange House Trust Fund Foundation (TMB) • Amendments • Action Points: 2.1-2.16 [= item 2 of the TBM3]	TFF/MB/MIN(2011)1 TFF/MB/M(2011)4
3. <u>For information:</u> Minutes of the 7 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Orange House Partnership Management Board (PMB) [= item 3 of the TBM3]	MB/M/MIN(2011)1
4. <u>For completion and/or signature:</u> the Draft Code of Conduct, the Declaration of Interest (DOI) and CVs [= item 5 of the TBM3]	TFF/MB(2011)1 MB/M(2009)10/ATT/REV1 CV-OHP Format
5. <u>For discussion and adoption:</u> Selection criteria for prioritising of projects submitted for funding [= item 6 of the TBM3]	TFF/MB/M(2011)5
6. <u>For discussion and approval:</u> draft letter to be signed by experts on duty about personal liability to third parties and other insurance issues [= item 7 of the TBM3]	TFF/MB/M(2011)6
7. <u>For information:</u> Update on current, scheduled and expected projects. Financial situation [= item 8 of the TBM3 and item 3 of the JM]	MB/M(2010)12/REV1 MB/M(2011)1/REV1 MB/M(2011)1/ATT/REV1 MB/M(2011)2
8. <u>For discussion:</u> distinguishing the Management Board of the Trust Fund Foundation from the Management Board of the Partnership: tasks and responsibilities of the members of the respective MB's [= item 4 of the TBM3 and item 4 of the JM]	MB/M(2009)1 MB/M(2010)2/REV2
9. Fund raising and acquisition efforts. [= item 11 of the TBM3 and item 5 of the JM]	No document
10. Website revision: comments, suggestions [= item 12 of the TBM3]	No document other than: <a href="http://www.orangeOhouse.eu">www.orangeOhouse.eu</a>
11. Any other business • Name cards [= item 13 of the TBM3 and item 6 of the JM]	No document

**Agenda Item 2: Draft minutes of the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Management Board of the Orange House Trust Fund Foundation (TMB)**  
**[Documents: TFF/MB/MIN(2011)1]**

3. The Chair asked for comments on the draft minutes of the 2<sup>st</sup> TMB meeting and the TMB members present adopted the minutes without changes. Subsequently, the Chair asked Herman Koëter (HK) to report on the action points as attached to the minutes. HK informed the meeting of the following:

Action Point 2.1: the STDF was contacted and a date for a meeting of HK with the Head of the STDF Secretariat was set at 6 December.

Action Point 2.2: no action was taken yet.

Action Point 2.3: a proposal was drafted by the secretariat. See agenda item 6.

Action Point 2.4: a proposal was drafted by the Secretariat. See agenda item 5.

Action Point 2.5: done.

Action Point 2.6: information was not yet received from Ezzeddine Boutrif (EB).

Action Point 2.7: no action was taken yet.

Action Point 2.8: the missing documents were received from EB. The CV of Coenraad Hendriksen (CH) was also received; his DOI is still missing.

Action Point 2.9: this action was put on hold until a next MB meeting with participation of all current members.

Action Point 2.10: this will be addressed under agenda item 9.

Action Point 2.11: no progress was made.

Action Point 2.12: this procedure will be applied for all new such requests.

Action Point 2.13: this will be addressed under agenda item 9.

Action Point 2.14: The secretariat has not yet received the requested information.

Action Point 2.15: done

Action Point 2.16: done.

4. The meeting noted that several action points had not yet been addressed. The Chair suggested to keep the still outstanding action points on the list of the current meeting. **[Action Point 3.1]**

**Agenda Item 3: Minutes of the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the OHP Management Board**  
**[Document: MB/M/MIN(2011)1]**

5. The members of the TMB took note of the minutes of the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the OHP Management Board and confirmed that paragraph 19 should be the thought starter for the discussion scheduled under item 8 of the agreed revised agenda.

**Agenda Item 4: Draft Code of Conduct**  
**[Document: TFF/MB/M(2011)1; CV-OHP format; DOI- OHP format]**

6. This agenda item was originally added to the agenda for those TMB members who had not yet signed the CoC and or the DOI. The Chair noted that these members were not present and suggested that this item should come back on the agenda of the 4<sup>th</sup> TMBM. **[Action Point 3.2].**

**Agenda Item 5: Selection criteria for prioritisation of projects submitted for funding**  
**[Document: TFF/MB/M(2011)5]**

7. The Chair asked HK to introduce the document. HK explained that in the document two types of selection criteria are proposed: (i) eligibility criteria and (ii) selection criteria. He further explained that the eligibility criteria are in fact prerequisites for the MB to accept any proposal for further consideration. The selection criteria address both the project content (scientifically, technically, financially, etc.) and the assumed impact on the country or region. The document also briefly addresses an approach for prioritising projects that have passed the selection process.

8. The meeting generally appreciated the document but a number of comments and suggestions were made to further improve the paper. Suggestions included: adding agriculture as an area that can be covered by OHP; adding financial implications to the selection criteria and deletion of the more specific priority scoring details. The meeting requested to put this document, amended as proposed, on the agenda of the 4<sup>th</sup> TMBM for adoption. **[Action Point: 3.3].**

**Agenda Item 6: Draft letter template about insurance coverage of personal liability to third parties of experts on mission**  
**[Document: TFF/MB/M(2011)6]**

9. The Chair asked HK to explain the purpose of the letter template. HK reminded the MB that at their second meeting proper insurance covering liability was discussed and that the MB had agreed to address liability issues in a clarifying letter to experts on mission emphasising the expert's responsibility to arrange for proper insurance. The costs of such insurance would obviously be covered by OHP. At the current stage of development of OHP this approach seems more practical than for OHP to cover in a general insurance policy all experts when on mission. Such a group insurance would be far more expensive as it would be based on worse case scenarios (e.g., all missions are assumed to be in high risk countries, and many more experts will be assumed to go on mission).

10. The meeting discussed the proposed letter content and agreed on the text with one modification: the insurance paragraph should be more visible (separated from the rest with the word 'insurance' in bold print). The secretariat will modify the letter as requested and will use it for any future mission. **[Action Point: 3.4].**

**Agenda Item 7: Update on current, scheduled and expected projects; and financial situation**  
**[Documents: MB/M(2010)12/REV1; MB/M(2011)1/REV1 +ATT; MB/M(2011)2]**

11. As CH was the only TMB member who was not also present at the PMBM8, the Chair suggested HK to be brief in updating the meeting on current activities. HK referred to document MB/M(2010)12/REV1 and mentioned that the projects still running were highlighted in yellow. He explained the progress with these projects as follows:

- a. RT(2010)1: EUCTP2. The development of the EUCTP2 project has so far been rather disappointing. In addition to the slow start of the project in April/May it also appeared that the EU Member States insisted on assignment of their national experts to many of the activities scheduled for 2011. Hence OHP experts would only come into play if national experts are not available or when there is no interest in EU Member States to be involved in a given activity. So far, OHP has only provided for a moderator of a round table discussion on milk risk assessment in Rouen, France (a 2-day mission of one expert). A second project of a somewhat more substantial size (30 days work) on a dairy feasibility study is currently being negotiated. It was originally scheduled for November but is likely to be postponed to January 2012. Financial benefits from this project to support zero tariff (ZT) projects are considered rather limited.
- b. RT(2010)6: Food information to consumers. The development of the project, including the development of the software application has taken more than 2 years without financial compensation for any of the 4 project partner organisations. The Netherlands Ministry of Health promised to provide some start-up funding (€20,000 or \$26,500) which will be shared with the other 3 project partners. Depending on the success of the project introduction event of 18 November and the subsequent willingness of the public and private sector to participate and share the costs involved, the kick-off meeting is foreseen for late January or February 2012. In case the interest in (financial) project participation will appear to be only marginal, the MB will be requested to decide whether further investment of human resources would still be justifiable.
- c. RT(2011)2: GHS Training in China and Southeast Asia. The project was aimed at capacity building in the area of classification and labelling of chemicals (GHS) in

Southeast Asia and China. The project was set up as a joint activity of UNITAR (responsible for the financial aspects and logistics, including the contact with local authorities) and OHP (responsible for the content and reporting) and comprised a series of 14 basic and advanced GHS training courses for public and private sector technical and management staff in China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines and Thailand, together involving 8 experts from Belgium, Canada, Germany, Finland, Ireland, New Zealand, and the USA. The training courses took place between 12 September and 11 November 2011. The project was budget-neutral and the final report is expected in February 2012.

- d. RT(2011)3: MOU with GAIN. HK mentioned the recent discussions with GAIN (the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition). Created in 2002 at a Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Children, GAIN supports public-private partnerships to increase access to the missing nutrients in diets necessary for people, communities and economies to be stronger and healthier. The basis for cooperation would be a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) the draft version of which was discussed by the PMB Board Members. In particular article 2.4 on "General Cooperation" should be modified to allow financial compensation for unilateral services, as appropriate. The MOU is likely to be signed in November 2011 and will be shared with both the PMB and TMB as soon as available **[Action Point: 3.5]**. This project may generate relevant funding for new zero tariff projects.
- e. RT(2011)4: new student fund. Exploratory discussions are ongoing with the Wageningen University on the possibility to establish a new sponsor fund for very bright MSc students from developing countries without any financial resources, no work experience and with strong motivation to serve the public sector of their home country once their studies are finished. It appears that currently no funds exist that cover students with such a profile. The Wageningen University could provide placement of such students in their food safety and quality MSc programme but is looking for a legal entity to manage a trust fund for sponsor donations. The 8<sup>th</sup> PMB meeting supported the suggestion that a fenced-off part of the OHTFF could be the home for this student fund as it would fit with the mission of the OHTFF and would provide visibility for the work of OHP and the OHTFF.

12. The meeting took note of these developments and the dim outlook with respect to the prospect of any of these projects to generate financial resources to cover new ZT projects. The TMB members agreed to go ahead with the development of the student fund and the OHP Trust Fund Foundation as the home of this new fund.

13. The Chair mentioned that since April this year projects RT(2010)8 and RT(2011)1 were finalised, the former being a series of GHS training courses in South Africa and the latter the development of an MOU with the University of Khartoum, Sudan.

14. The Meeting noted that the projected budget as published in the Attachment to document MB/M(2011)1/REV1 appeared to be too optimistic: revenues will be minimal in 2011. The Chair referred to agenda items 8 and 9 of the adopted agenda where the financial prospects will be further discussed

**Agenda Item 8: Mandates of the PMB and the TMB: tasks and responsibilities**  
**[Documents: MB/M(2009)1 and MB/M(2010)2/REV2]**

15. The Chair reminded the meeting of paragraph 19 of the minutes of PMBM7 which read: "Essentially the MB of the OHTFF has as its major tasks: (i) setting priorities for projects in developing countries, (ii) evaluate priority projects with respect to input, output, impact and efficiency, and (iii) fund raising for the Trust Fund. The MB of OHP is factually the executive body for the management of the OHP as an organisation, including the Secretariat, the website, and recruitment of experts, as well as all projects (paid and unpaid). The MB of OHP has also the task

to raise funds and acquire paid projects to cover the expenses of the Secretariat and feed the Trust Fund of the TMB". He further referred to the Bye-Laws of both organisations: document MB/M(2009)1 for the bye laws of the Partnership association and document MB/M(2010)2/REV2 for the bye laws of the Trust Fund Foundation.

16. The Meeting considered it not very clear whether certain projects only or all projects would be reviewed by the Management of the Trust Fund Foundation. Following discussion it was agreed that all projects that are expected to turn out financially negative (all ZT and a number of RT projects) should go to the Trust Fund Foundation for evaluation, selection, priority setting and impact assessment. Projects that are expected to generate a surplus and those that are budgetary neutral should be dealt with directly by the Partnership MB (PMB). Although the scientific merit and impact of the latter projects are certainly considered important, most certainly when carried out for the public sector and in developing countries, they would not normally require formal evaluation by the TMB. The representatives of both Boards agreed that gaining some experience with a number of projects would bring more clarity on a preferred approach and that for the time being mutual information exchange between the 2 Boards would be crucial to avoid misunderstanding and duplication of work. It was further agreed that the highest priority should now be to build up the fund, thus allowing to accept and carry out projects with a negative turnout.

17. The Boards confirmed that the breadth of scientific/technical areas covered by OHP is substantial and that this should probably kept that way at least as long as each area offered is indeed covered by at least one expert with the required expertise. Pharmaceuticals as a focus area excludes the therapeutic aspects but includes the safety and the classification of chemical ingredients (occupational health and environmental safety).

18. With respect to individual tasks and responsibilities of MB members the meeting agreed that apart from the Chair (AG for the PMB and HK for the TMB) and Financial Officer (HS for both), other functions or specific tasks should only be discussed with all, or most, members present.

**Agenda Item 9: Fund raising and other acquisition efforts  
[no documents]**

19. The members of both Management Boards present were well aware of the current shortage of project funding. They also agreed that all could be more pro-active and creative as ambassadors of OHP. Following a rather lengthy discussion all agreed that more efforts should be made by all and that the Secretariat should involve board members more closely in the day-to-day developments, both collectively and individually, to get a dialogue started and for MB members to feel being involved. It also appeared that personal email messages work better than collective messages and individual skype video calls could be used in between meetings to maintain the feeling of being connected. Board members, when travelling should let the Secretariat and colleague-MB members know where they go as this could be an opportunity to see somebody or pay a courtesy visit to an organisation or institute.

20. The following suggestions, actions and approaches were considered as steps towards more coherently functioning and involved management boards and, subsequently, towards an increase in opportunities for funding:

- a. For the Secretariat to organise single issue skype meetings with MB members interested and/or involved between face-to-face MB meetings and to reduce the face-to-face meetings to maximum 2 meetings/year **[Action Point 3.6];**
- b. For the Secretariat to make its requests to MB members more focussed, more specific and personalised **[Action Point 3.6];**
- c. For Board Members to inform the Secretariat and colleague MB Members of their travel schedules and allow time to make a courtesy visit to promote OHP **[Action Point 3.7];**

- d. For Board Members to be alert when it comes to issues they pick up that could be of interest to OHP, such as possible participation in projects of third parties, need for expertise in the agriculture, chemical and food management areas **[Action Point 3.7];**
- e. For the Secretariat to continue to inform MB Members of the outcome of training courses and other capacity building activities **[Action Point 3.6];**
- f. For all to identify parties, both from the private and public sector in a developing country requesting for scientific or technical capacity building support, to contribute financially to the requested activity **[Action Points 3.6 and 3.7];**
- g. Projects of a duration of several years such as the Food Information Transparency Initiative (FITI) have a high potential for multi-annual funding; additional projects such as these would broaden the basis for a sustainable future for OHP;
- h. One-day discussion and information exchange meetings on hot topics in food or chemical safety and management could be organised for the food and/or chemical industry and attendants should pay a fair fee: such topics could include: (i) recent legislative changes, (ii) discrepancies between EU and USA, (iii) preventing food crises, etc. **[Action Point 3.6];**
- i. The experience built at the various GHS training courses could be used to generate some of the needed financial resources by offering such training for the private sector, starting in Brussels with CEFIC, ECETOC, and others **[Action Point 3.6].**

#### **Agenda Item 10: Web site revision**

21. The website has been modified in order to give more visibility to the Trust Fund Foundation as a separate entity, rather than sitting under one of several buttons on the Partnership home page. The meeting was happy with the changes and additions and all look forward to seeing the OHTFF site develop further.

#### **Agenda Item 11: Any other business**

22. HK reminded the meeting that name cards should be printed for all members of the TMB and that these name cards should be similar to the OHP name cards provided to the PMB members and senior experts, but somewhat modified as agreed at TMBM2 (see paragraph 18 of the minutes). However, the Secretariat has not yet received the personal details TMB Members wish to see on the card in addition to their MB function (Chair, Secretary, Financial Officer, Member) such as titles, phone, fax, mobile and address details. **[Action point 3.1.f].**

23. The Chair closed the meeting at 13:00.

#### **SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS:**

See next page

**SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS**

**PMBM8 & TBM3:**

**Action Point 3.1:** The following actions were carried over from TBM2:

- a. The Managing Director will explore insurance options that cover personal .
- b. EB, who has very good contacts in Qatar will probe his contacts for the country's need for a food policy. HK will send him the full tender submission.
- c. HK in consultation with EB to contact ICD and seek cooperation/funding.
- d. CH will send his signed DOI to the Secretariat as soon as possible.
- e. EB and HK will work on an MOU between FAO and OHP which would facilitate mutual cooperation.
- f. All agreed to inform the Secretariat of the details they wish to see on their name card in addition to their MB function (Chair, Secretary, Financial Officer, Member) such as titles, phone, fax, mobile and address details.

**Action Point 3.2:** The Code of Conduct (COC) and the Declaration of Interest (DOI) should be signed by members of the Board who had not yet done so.

**Action Point 3.3:** Revision of document TFF/MB/M(2011)5 taking into account suggestions made at TBM3.

**Action Point 3.4:** HK will revise document TFF/MB/M(2011)6 and circulate it for information to both Management Boards

**Action Point 3.5:** The MOU between OHP and GAIN is likely to be signed in November 2011 and will be shared with the Board as soon as available.

**Action Point 3.6:** the following actions should be made by the secretariat:

- a. organising single issue skype meetings with MB members interested and/or involved between face-to-face MB meetings and to reduce the face-to-face meetings to maximum 2 meetings/year;
- b. making its requests to MB members more focussed, more specific and personalised;
- c. continuing informing MB Members of the outcome of training courses and other capacity building activities
- d. identifying parties, both from the private and public sector in a developing country requesting for scientific or technical capacity building support, to contribute financially to the requested activity;
- e. organising one-day discussion and information exchange meetings on hot topics in food or chemical safety and management could be organised for the food and/or chemical industry and attendants should pay a fair fee: such topics could include: (i) recent legislative changes, (ii) discrepancies between EU and USA, (iii) preventing food crises, etc.
- f. development of GHS training courses for the private sector, starting in Brussels with CEFIC, ECETOC, and others, built on the experience gained in recent years.

**Action Point 3.7:** the following actions should be made by members of the Management Boards of the Orange House Partnership and the Orange House Trust Fund Foundation:

- a. informing the Secretariat and colleague MB Members of their travel schedules and allow time to make a courtesy visit to promote OHP;
- b. being alert when it comes to issues they pick up that could be of interest to OHP, such as possible participation in projects of third parties, need for expertise in the agriculture, chemical and food management areas;
- c. identifying parties, both from the private and public sector in a developing country requesting for scientific or technical capacity building support, to contribute financially to the requested activity.